

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

with the statement in the office action that "compliant" as per atomic messages is not in the claim(s). Claim 98 specifically states the steps of (1) analyzing the plurality of atomic messages for compliance with the first set of rules; and (2) executing compliant database events (emphasis added).

The next limitation, sending a signal to a console operator when a database event is not compliant with the first set of rules, is cited to Bapat's disclosure that if a match is found, the request is denied, and a response is returned to the initiator if appropriate. Again, applicant does not see a signal being sent to a console operator when an event is not compliant with a first set of rules.

The next limitation, allowing a console operator to create exceptions when signals are sent by the listening agent, is cited to users authorized to modify the access control tree. The statement in Bapat that someone is authorized to modify the access control tree is not the step of allowing a console operator to create exceptions when signals are sent by the listening agent. Whether the invention of Bapat may be customized does not disclose this process step.

The next limitation, updating the first set of rules with the exceptions created by the console operator, is cited to users authorized to modify the access control tree. The limitation is a step; updating the rules created by the console operator. The Bapat disclosure merely states that there are users authorized to modify the access control tree. This does not meet the limitation of the instant process step.

The next and last limitation, storing the signals received by the console operator in a data file residing with the console, is cited to the deny/grant decision for each access request may be stored in a security audit trail. The cited portion of Bapat does not

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

disclose storing the signals received by the console operator, nor that the data file resides with the console, and thus this limitation is not anticipated by the cited disclosure.

In view of these considerations, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 98 should be withdrawn.

As per claim 101, the applicants note that claim 101 is dependent on claim 98, and is not independent. The citation to Bapat does not show specifically the subject matter of claim 101, i.e., that the particular SQL statement is a write operation to a data dictionary, rather, the citation merely states that a suspicious directory name would generate a notification, with a subsequent rejection if a match is found.

Section 103

It is noted that the Examiner has rejected claims 99 - 104 as being unpatentable over Bapat in view of a number of different references. Those references include Shostack, (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,445) hereinafter referred to as Shostack; Reshef (U.S. Pat. No. 6,321,337) hereinafter referred to as Reshef; and Rowland (U.S. Pat. No. 6,405,318) hereinafter referred to as Rowland.

Dependent claim 99: Shostack does not teach the implementation of a buffer overflow analysis at the database level. The present invention is directed to database level, SQL analysis, which is not taught or suggested by Shostack.

Dependent claim 100: Reshef is cited for detecting whether an executable SQL statement includes an operating system call, where Reshef merely states that "[a]ny breach of the permitted flow sequences by disorderly operating system calls or looping will be trapped and logged." Reshef does not teach or disclose the analysis of the present invention, which applies to SQL statements for a system that resides at the database level.

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 22 2009

Dependent claims 102-104: Rowland is not a compatible structure or method with the present invention. Rowland is directed to intercepting activity at the IP/TCP level, and not at the database level. Rowland does not disclose any method of analyzing SQL statements at the database level, which is the purpose of the present invention.

Non-Analogous Art

Applicants respectfully request that the examiner reconsider the decision that Reshef is analogous art. Applicants maintain that the reference is nonanalogous art because Reshef concerns a security gateway system positioned between an external, untrusted computing environment and an internal, trusted computing environment, and does not concern security at the database level through analysis of SQL statements.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the above places the application in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Law Offices of Peter S. Canelias

June 22, 2009

By: _____

Peter S. Canelias
Reg. No. 40,547
Law Offices of Peter S. Canelias
420 Lexington Avenue-Suite 2620
New York, NY 10170
Tel: (212) 223-9654
Fax: (212) 223-9651